Chapter 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter 2 is divided into six main parts:

1) The purpose of a literature review
   a) Overview: Reading between the lines
   b) The use of literature
   c) Sources of literature: An open approach
2) Academic scholarship and performance evaluation of faculty work
   a) Overview: Reading between the lines
   b) The use of literature
   c) Sources of literature: An open approach
3) Characteristics of a performance evaluation system in higher education
4) Recognition of work by faculty in the field of film and digital media
5) Change in institutions of higher learning: challenges and obstacles
6) Summary

Part 1/The purpose of a literature review is divided into three sections:

a) Overview: Reading between the lines

The traditional template for defining, recognizing, and evaluating faculty work reveals many layers of submerged and unacknowledged meaning. By reading between the lines I see a landscape of implicit values that exist underneath the surface. I see that both the trilogy and the template emphasize scientism in higher education, a value system that prevails without conscious awareness of its implications. In literature that intends to explain or justify the status quo of performance evaluation I understand what has been expressed, but I also discern what has not been expressed---gaps within the main body of ideas. Critical inquiry facilitates and provokes a deeper understanding of the multiple layers of meaning that are found as I have openly questioned the terminologies and implicit values of the trilogy and the traditional template.

b) The use of literature

What is a literature review and what is its purpose? A conventional literature review is a detailed discussion of what has been published in a given area of study. It is intended to justify the approach of an inquiry and its selection of methods in relation to the research problem and

the research questions, and to demonstrate that the research will be a contribution to the body of knowledge in a given area of study (Hart, 1998; Levy and Ellis, 2006). It serves, in part, to affirm the credibility of both the dissertation and the writer (Gall, Borg and Gall, 1996). The quality of a literature review should demonstrate "appropriate breadth and depth, rigor and consistency, clarity and brevity, and effective analysis and synthesis" (Hart, 1998, p. 1). Levy and Ellis (2006) propose that:

> an effective literature review should do the following: a) methodologically analyze and synthesize quality literature, b) provide a firm foundation to a research topic, c) provide a firm foundation to the selection of research methodology, and d) demonstrate that the proposed research contributes something new to the overall body of knowledge or advances the research field's knowledge base (p. 2).

A literature review that is informed by an understanding of systems theory and systems thinking will focus attention upon the *whole*, rather than upon the parts, facilitating an understanding that things, ideas, people and groups of people are systems within ever-larger systems, *ad infinitum*. An "open" approach in the use of literature can be characterized as purposeful and continuous sensitivity to the emergence of observable systemic relationships through broad based reading and other data collection; conversely, a "closed" approach limits the scope of input and inhibits the making of systemic connections, reducing the potential that decisions will yield benefits, change and action that solves a problem (Schockley-Zalabak, 1999, p. 43). I consider my approach to the literature as open. Chapter 3 describes further my open approach and method of inquiry with literature and other sources of data that have informed this dissertation research.

From a perspective rooted in systems theory, a literature review should also demonstrate that inquiry was a *process of learning*, a sequence of steps or activities (Levy and Ellis, 2006). Levy and Ellis (2006) recommend a three-step process for developing a "sound and effective literature review…1) inputs 2) processing and 3) outputs" (p. 2). An effective literature review that follows this three-stage process will be able to demonstrate a thorough and systematic examination of the existing body of knowledge from literature (Levy and Ellis, 2006). Borrowing from systems theory and Levy and Ellis (2006), I am taking in new information by reading and gathering a range of data (inputs), transforming the incoming information with my own understanding (processing), and then giving back and sharing new information in the form of this dissertation and its embedded layers of ideas (outputs) (Levy and Ellis, 2006; Bloom, 1956). This is a continuous process and descriptive of my approach to the literature, and to my method of research inquiry.

A postmodernist approach justifies, compels and encourages the inclusion and consideration of readings and sources of data that do not necessarily reflect mainstream perceptions or expectations about the particular topic of this dissertation. From a postmodern and post-positivist perspective, "reality can never be apprehended, only approximated," and this idea allows the de-centralization of source(s) that inform the research and the use of methods for inquiry, placing great value upon a juxtaposition of perspectives, contexts, and methods as a way of capturing as much of reality as possible (Guba, 1990, p. 2). It places great value upon the emergence of ambiguities, discrepancies and alternatives, rejecting traditional, artificial and imposed frames of order such as conventional expectations of structure and literary style (Guba, 1990; Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). I have prioritized some sources that reject, sharply criticize, or deconstruct the status quo in many contexts; and have integrated some theoretical writings that

emphasize *self*, honoring the first-person voice as a source of data. Postmodernism permits the crossing of boundaries that define the breadth and nature of everything that is presumed to be knowable---including reality, existence, culture, power, authority, meaning, causation, knowledge, ethics and more. Borrowing from postmodernism and with reference to grounded theory, I have taken the liberty to read and consider *everything* as data, then to determine afterwards how it fits, or not (Barthes, 1977; Glaser, 1976).

Lippman (1989) coined the term *granularity* in relation to interactivity in new media to define the point at which the interaction with a new media text (e.g., a word, a page, a video or audio segment, a part of computer game) can be interrupted by a reader (Voithofer, 2005). In planning a study, researchers determine the data granularity that they require to answer research questions, as well as determining, with dissemination editors, the depth to which the reader should be allowed to enter into the data (Voithofer, 2005). A simple example can be the use of a digital camera to capture visual documentation from a school. A digital camera is capable of recording more detail than is generally offered through a graphic on a website or a photograph in a book or journal article. Often this means reducing the size and resolution of a digital image or cropping it to better fit it on a Web page or printed page. These processes remove visual information that the reader may find useful. Through selection the researcher decides what data are relevant to a study based on the research questions, theoretical framework, and available research resources, including time, materials, funds, and researcher training. The increasing capacity and lower cost of the computer to store large amounts of information can tempt a researcher to capture large quantities of data. Data oversaturation can be prevalent in the process of studying online learning environments or in the learning that occurs on the computer where screen movement, typing, and time on computer tasks can generate large amounts of detailed

information. A way to approach the design and selection of new media data is through theorizing data granularity (Voithofer, 2005).

Knowing when to quit gathering, organizing and analyzing of incoming research data, including the reading of literature, is a skill developed through experience, and this important aspect of the research process is implied in a literature review. According to many theorists, the literature review continues until the study is completed; throughout the course of input-processing-output (Levy and Ellis, 2006; Glaser, 1976). The usual processes of research inquiry, including the input-processing-output of research data from literature, involves changes in methodology, addition of new constructs, and the reconciliation of conflicting data from literature that requires further research. Borrowing from the method of grounded theory, the general rule is to gather data until each category is saturated and develops properties of the conceptual categories (Glaser, 1976). As a category reaches a point of theoretical saturation, the researcher moves on to other categories. In this way, the literature review is an organic system that is constantly growing and changing as the study develops (Levy and Ellis, 2006). Therefore, I consider the literature review as a process, and it was not completed until all the research associated with the study was completed.

This chapter intends to be consistent with the intentions and expectations of a conventional literature review---yet is inclined toward the openness of a postmodern approach---illustrating the scope and nature of literature relevant to the area of study, demonstrating important gaps in knowledge for further inquiry, and convincing the reader how this research makes a contribution to the body of knowledge for the purpose of solving the problem. The literature cited in this chapter emerges from my construal of what is related to the research problem and the range of questions that frame the inquiry of this dissertation; and has influenced

my personalized writing approach and method---all of which serve in some way to inform my proposed solution to the problem. This chapter also provides a framework for Chapter 5 where I relate my ideas and findings that that have emerged from inquiry with previously established data.

c) Sources of literature: An open approach

The literature review reflects an aspect of the process of learning that I personally experienced, as a participant, and that I observed, as a scholar. An important aspect of this research has been informed through analysis of a broad range of qualitative data found in literature. This has facilitated the emergence and intersection of pertinent themes that have informed the research problem and research question(s). The process has included:

- Comparative analysis of traditional and alternative notions of what constitutes scholarship and academic research as a activity by faculty members;
- Comparative analysis of performance evaluation practices in the field of film and digital media with academic disciplines outside the field of film and digital media;
- Analysis of court records and legal writings about issues raised by faculty members in courts of law pertaining to perceived injustices in connection with negative performance evaluations in colleges and universities;
- Analysis of text-based statements, briefing papers, monographs and other pertinent documents generated by national and international organizations, educational institutions, agencies and specialized professional associations that provide detailed analysis and recommendations for standards relevant to the evaluating academic performance practices and theoretical underpinnings from diverse disciplinary perspectives;

- Analysis of scholarly, historical and theoretical writings about emergent and relevant themes that have included ethics, creativity, power, leadership and change;
- Integration of theoretical and practical notions about auto/ethnography as a form of scholarly research writing.

My open approach to the literature has addressed the scope and nature of the emergent themes from a variety of perspectives and media. Through reading and analysis this study has reached out to films, books, articles and on line sources that provide practical, theoretical, legal and historical perspectives, published in the proceedings of professional organizations; scholarly journals in the field of education, law and other scholarly areas; trade publications; and a variety of online documents---in addition to my own self-reflective writing and survey query of interviewees (Methods are discussed in Chapters 3).

Certain scholars have emerged as key experts that have substantially informed my inquiry from various perspectives, including: Boyer (1988, 1990), Diamond (1993; 1999), Braxton, Luckey and Helland, (2002); Braxton, (2006); Diamond and Adam (2000), Bukalski (2000), Friere (1998; 2000), Glassick, Huber and Maeroff (1997), La Pelle (1997), Four Arrows (2008), and Denzin and Lincoln (2000); but there are many other scholarly writings (described in this Chapter) that I have studied (input-processed-output); and each source has contributed greatly to the building of this dissertation. I am very grateful for each work and each scholar that has shared knowledge that has informed my inquiry, but I feel obliged to specifically highlight the above-listed scholars as they have had the greatest influence and impact upon my ability to think and frame the complexity of ideas as I have developed this dissertation. To them I am very grateful as they opened doors for me as I searched for new ideas and possible solutions to a big (yet specific) problem that faces faculty in the field of film and digital media.

Specific mention should also be made about the literature that has been published and disseminated by professional associations such as the University Film and Video Association (UFVA), National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD), College Arts Association (CAA), and others. A wide range of publications by these organizations have been helpful for defining new and old institutional and traditional priorities, and also have been helpful in determining what gaps and omissions exist in current practices for performance evaluation in higher education, particularly in the context of faculty work in the field of film and digital media. Faculty priorities are strongly influenced by the statements and agendas of professional disciplinary associations, at national and international levels, because:

> …faculty tend to identify themselves, first, as members of the community with whom they share scholarly interests. In the competitive marketplace of higher education, the statements and agendas of professional disciplinary associations articulate the current climate and relevant concerns affecting faculty in higher education, and provide critical perspectives about promotion and tenure guidelines (Diamond, 1993c, p. 15).

A broad list of organizations, institutions, agencies and associations that have published papers relevant to the question of what is constituted as research activity by faculty include:

American Association of University Professors (AAUP; USA)

American Association for Higher Education (AAHE; USA)

National Association of School of Art and Deisgn (NASAD; USA)

NASAD Working Group on the Arts in Higher Education (NASAD; USA)

University Film and Video Association (UFVA; USA)

Broadcast Education Association (BEA; USA)

American Anthropological Association (AAA; USA)

Council for Arts Accrediting Associations (CAAA; UK)

College Art Association (CAA; USA)

Policy statements that have been published by each of these organizations have facilitated an understanding of the implications inherent to the traditional template as it continues to be used to measure and define scholarly work, despite significant evidence in data of its irrelevance in many contexts. Organizational statements have been useful for contextualizing my own experience as a participant in this research, and the phenomenological writing of project interviewees to this project, serving served as a starting point that affirms and solves the problem that has been posed in this dissertation.

Part 2: Academic scholarship and performance evaluation of faculty work

Part 2 is divided into two main sections:

a) Terminologies for faculty work and its evaluation

b) Historical and contemporary perspective about faculty work

Part 2 discusses literature that was used to explore the historical, theoretical and conceptual roots for what constitutes scholarship by academic faculty in institutions of higher learning. The purpose is to locate artistic, scholarly, and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media within the broad spectrum of what is constituted as scholarship and scholarly activity.

1) Terminologies about faculty work and its evaluation

What does it mean to be a scholar? What constitutes scholarly work by faculty, according to traditional and contemporary perspectives? I look at this complex question from multiple perspectives---historical, critical, and alternative---advocating for those of us at the borders.

Today, according to Boyer (1990), "being scholarly" is synonymous with academic rank at a college or university, and with the performance of scientific research that results in publication (p. 15). According to the "dominant view, to be a scholar has primarily come to me being a researcher---and publication is the primary yardstick by which scholarly productivity is measured" (Boyer, 1990, p. 2). Scholars are perceived to be academics, conducting research and publishing papers, and then perhaps conveying their knowledge by sharing their knowledge with

students through teaching or by applying it in other social, clinical, commercial or other contexts (Boyer, 1990).

The category of research reflects only a portion of what constitutes the scholarly work performed and prioritized by faculty; so the term proposed by Boyer (1990), *scholarship*, is more indicative of the broad range of faculty activities. Boyer (1990) wrote: "we conclude that the work of the professoriate might be though of as having four separate, yet overlapping functions. These are: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application and the scholarship of teaching" (p. 16). Therefore, Boyer (1990) has clarified that research is included in the scholarly activities and priorities of faculty, but faculty priorities and activities are not limited to research. Further, Denzin and Lincoln (2000) have contextualized the powerful, negative political significance of the term, "research," implicating it with the exploitive and hegemonic legacy of colonialism and imperialism (p. 1; Smith, 1999). Therefore, as appropriate, I have opted for the terms, scholarship, faculty work and/or faculty scholarship, rather than relying on the narrower and problematic term, research.

Concerning the output of faculty work, the result of research, scholarly work, or other form of scholarship activity, Koch (1998) uses the term, "research product" (p. 1183), and I believe this term is suited to broadly include the diverse forms of output from scholarly work that emerge in film and digital media. In this dissertation I interchangeably and synonymously use the terms: scholarship, faculty work, research product, or output to signify the result of scholarship activity by faculty.

Is it better to consider the process as an *assessment* rather than an *evaluation*, or vice versa? An etymological and epistemological quagmire, a *potpourri* of connotations and denotations, bubbles to the surface when one inquires about the words, *assessment, evaluation,*

review and their many cousins. There terms are used interchangeably, but the terms are not synonymous. Using many dictionaries, online and traditional, a composite definition of assessment is: *an estimation* of the *worth, value, or quality* of a person or thing. An evaluation is: *to ascertain or fix* the *value or worth of*; *to examine and judge carefully*; to *appraise*. Assessments are intended to estimate, while evaluations ascertain, fix, examine, appraise and judge carefully. Value and worth are consistent with assessment and evaluation, but any determination about quality has disappeared as we move from assessment to evaluation. As appraisal enters the fray, by way of evaluation, there is a nearly synonymous definition with assessment---the classification of someone or something with respect to its worth. *Worth* emerges singularly as the term that reaches across the terrain of performance evaluation terminology. Evaluations and assessments are searching to determine *worth*. If performance evaluations are also assessments or appraisals, or vice versa, the one term and concept that is consistent in all cases is that each process is a test to determine worth.

Is the process of evaluation or assessment similar to a test?---perhaps the whole process can borrow its meaning from the sciences and be called an acid test, which means a decisive or critical test for worth or quality; a rigorous and conclusive test to establish worth or value. Arguably, the performance evaluation is actually an acid test to determine worth, but some other terms illustrate ethical and philosophical concerns that could emerge during the gauntlet of any acid test in the field of film and digital media:

- Overvaluation - too high a value or price assigned to something, in comparison with something else
- Undervaluation- too low a value or price assigned to something, in comparison with something else

- Pricing- the evaluation of something in terms of its potentially-fluctuating market value
- Re-evaluation - the evaluation of something a second time (or more)

Defining the performance evaluation process as an acid test that intends to determine worth would be reasonably accurate and valid in the context higher education settings as it is currently and commonly being practiced, but there will certainly be some who might not accept such direct verbiage, so I might as well revert to the terms most commonly used---performance evaluation, performance assessment, or both---because they share the purpose of determining the worth of the work being considered.

Guskey (2000) shows that the concept of evaluation is subtly distinct from assessment, yet these two terms are commonly and interchangeably used without regard to nuanced distinctions. Guskey (2000) writes, "Evaluation is the systematic investigation of worth and merit," implying a process that is "thoughtful, intentional and purposeful," done for clear reasons (p. 41-42). Merit and worth imply appraisal of value and judgment about achievement, and evaluations, unlike assessments, are intended to determine the value and/or merit of something, according to standards of quality (Guskey, 2000). Guskey (2000) suggests that faculty evaluations should be designed to consider both evaluation and assessment, being based upon merit and value (Guskey, 2000).

Guskey (2000) argues that merit and value are not usually considered inherent in the conventional definition of assessment, and states, "no evaluation can be completely objective, the process is not based on opinion or conjecture…Instead, it (should be) based on the acquisition of specific, relevant and valid evidence examined through appropriate methods and techniques" (Guskey, 2000 p. 42). On the other hand, assessment is any of a variety of procedures used to obtain information, is impartial and does not involve any judgment about the

merit or worth (Linn and Gronlund, 1995, Guskey, 2000). This etymological detail might seem microscopic in scale, but terminological disregard represents a basic level of ignorance that seeps into the process of evaluating faculty scholarship. Assessment is not an evaluation, and vice versa. Further, are the standards being used for evaluation of faculty research relative or absolute? Are the standards and results of evaluation simply best estimates of value or merit as determined by peers, perhaps peers who share no common knowledge base with the work and subject area under review? Guskey (2000) also posits a view that research and evaluation have a great deal in common because "both involve systematic inquiry in order to gain new knowledge, and both terms infer quantitative and qualitative methodologies to address specific questions" (Guskey, 2000, p. 44).

It is not useful to use the terms *quality*, *achievement* or any other important terms in the abstract. To conduct meaningful analyses and make practical decisions, it is necessary to talk about achievement and quality in terms of something. Vague, ill-defined terms that underpin the application of irrelevant and narrowly conceived criteria are counter-productive and exacerbate many problems that threaten faculty careers and the institutional workplace environment. The use of accurate and relevant terms to define, describe and guide the process of review, assessment, or evaluation of the scope and nature of faculty work in film and digital media is a first step in the right direction. As discussed in this section, there are nuanced and significant etymological and epistemological differences in several key terms. This is a first problem that I discovered through reading and analysis of pertinent literature---deciding and understanding what are the best terms that most accurately the task and process of work being performed by faculty and evaluated in institutional settings---using terms that most closely and consistently describe the historical and philosophical vision and mission of my inquiry.

The word, work, is used in title and text because it provides an umbrella for the different types of faculty activities essential to the arts in higher education. This umbrella is necessary because definitions of such terms as creative activity, research, scholarship, teaching, and service can be either narrow or broad. For example, when broadly defined, research can include the process of making a work of art: a search for the new is involved. When more narrow definitions based on science or humanities methodologies are applied, making art is not research, although research of scientific or humanistic types may be involved in the total art-making process. The word, work, enables respect and use of both narrow and broad definitions as institutions, organizations, and individuals may determine in specific circumstances. Whether broad or narrow, my use of the term, *work*, always indicates an intense merging of thought, skill, and emotion.

2) Historical and contemporary perspectives about faculty work

How does an historical overview relate to a literature review and to my overall inquiry? I have relied upon scholarly literature to facilitate my understanding of what is constituted as conventional research and other forms of academic scholarship, and to critically examine the nature of performance evaluation of faculty research and scholarship from historical and contemporary perspectives. My intention is to understand what have been the historical priorities that have defined faculty work in higher education.

As described in Chapter 1, faculty members in higher education are expected to perform a trilogy of work---teaching, research and service. Research, whether qualitative or quantitative, is a very important area of responsibility and accountability for faculty in higher education. From an historical perspective, traditional and conventional expectations in research have

prioritized verifiability, discovery, measurability and a hierarchy of experts and facts. However, hegemony and primacy of traditional and conventional approaches to research are being challenged by the emergence of alternative methods and new forms of outcomes from scholarly work (Four Arrows, 2008). The challenges and possibilities posed by a critical reading of literature from historical and contemporary perspectives about scholarly work have informed and enabled my advocacy for the recognition of alternative methods and outcomes---as I have sought to address the research problem and research problem of this dissertation.

Boyer (1990) and many others have raised and debated some of the most important questions and issues that affect faculty careers in institutions of higher learning today. About twenty years have passed since Boyer (1990) and Rice (1990) developed groundbreaking theories that advocate change in faculty priorities and reform in educational institutions, but the challenges and questions they posed remain unresolved. Boyer (1990) proposed that faculty work consists of four distinct yet interrelated domains

- The scholarship of discovery
- The scholarship of application
- The scholarship of integration
- The scholarship of teaching through the sharing of knowledge

Rice (1991), like Boyer (1990), divides scholarly work into four components:

- The advantage of knowledge: original research
- The integration of knowledge: synthesizing and reintegrating knowledge, revealing new patterns of meaning, and new relationship between the parts and the whole.
- The application of knowledge: professional practice directly related to an individual's scholarly specialization.

- The transformation of knowledge through teaching: including pedagogical content knowledge and discipline-specific educational theory.

Throughout this dissertation, the question of what is constituted as faculty work in the field of film and digital media is considered to inform a response to the subsequent question of recognizing and evaluating such work in a performance evaluation. These questions compel a review of Rice (1991) and Boyer (1990) as starting points, followed by study of the works of several other key scholars (Diamond, 1993, 1999; Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 2002; Braxton, 2006; Glassick, Huber and Maeroff, 1997). Ultimately, my purpose is to discern a historical context while expressing the unique and diverse characteristics of faculty work in film and digital media, and to mold a conceptual model that reflects the values and language of this particular field.

In the past few years, in a few university settings, reforms have been envisioned and implemented, moving gradually toward acknowledgement of the breadth and diversity of faculty work in creative fields (Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 2007; Glassick, Huber and Maeroff, 1997; Diamond, 1993; Diamond, 1999). Data reflects such a change, and an implicit resistance to change, in the publications of academic institutions, for example, in faculty handbooks, university by-laws, mission statements, and other official institutional statements. It is not uncommon these days to find that a typical university faculty handbook will state a gumbo of expectations that implicitly draw from the four-part model of Boyer (1990) and/or Rice (1991), making statements that addresses the trilogy of expectations for teaching, research and service: for example…the University defines the term scholarly activity as: scholarship directed toward new discovery, investigations resulting in *creative and artistic expressions*, the evolution of

novel and more effective teaching methodologies and materials, and the integration and application of new methodologies in the profession. In Chapter 4 it is demonstrated that most faculty in the field of film and digital have no awareness at all of the new model of faculty scholarship that has been proposed by Boyer (1990), nor do they seem to have awareness of other theoretical bases for ontological change pertaining to performance evaluation of faculty work---despite their nearly unanimous recognition of the research problem in their institutional workplace.

A body of literature has emerged in response to Boyer (1990) and Rice (1991) that has critically examined issues relating to the research problem and the research question from historical and theoretical perspectives (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000; Glassick, Huber and Maeroff, 1997; Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 2002; Braxton, 2006; Diamond, 1993; Diamond and Adam, 2000). This literature has facilitated contextualization and depth of understanding about contemporary issues that converge in the research problem and research question---the recognition and evaluation of faculty work in the field of film and digital media during performance evaluation.

The priorities and social issues confronting the academy in contemporary times, such as the problems and questions about the recognition and evaluation of faculty work as examined in this dissertation, are profoundly different than matters faced by the academy in the previous times. In earlier times, being scholarly and notions of "scholarship…referred to a variety of creative work carried on in various places, and its integrity was measured by the ability to think, communicate and learn" (Boyer, 1990, p. 15). Over the past few hundred years of higher education in the United States, research as a faculty activity "remained the exception rather than the rule. The principal mission at most of the nation's colleges and universities continued to be

the education of undergraduates" (Boyer, 1990, p. 18-19). Boyer (1990) argues that the hegemony of the today's prevailing paradigm, including the prioritization of scientific research methods and text-based publications, has not always been *de rigueur* for faculty scholarship.

From the late 1940s onward, knowledge in educational institutions came to be defined according to the values and conventions of a modernist, rational approach to science based on logical positivism and empiricism. As the twentieth century saw the development of visual culture through a succession of representational technologies—photography, narrative and documentary film, medical and scientific imaging, television, video, virtual realities, and so forth—"visuality" developed as a way to describe how seeing is culturally framed in technologies, communities, and institutions. Visuality is formed at the intersections of visual media, sensory perception, and power. Images are an important channel through which ideologies are remediated and onto which ideologies are projected (Sturken and Cartwright, 2001. p. 21). In the modernist perspective, knowledge is thought to consist of theoretically organized constructs and propositions, logically derived and empirically tested, that can explain and predict phenomena. Such knowledge is stable, cumulative, decontextualized, and generalizable. Throughout the post-WWII period and up to the present day, as discussed in Chapter 1, faculty members have been expected to successfully perform a traditional trilogy of work---scholarly research, teaching and in providing services to their school and community---- and the trilogy of work continues strongly intact and prioritized at a majority of institutions of higher learning.

Moving through distinct and various historical "moments" in the era since World War II, the expectations of faculty work have skewed away from teaching and service, and moved toward the advancement of scientific research (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000, p. 27; Boyer, 1990).

According to Boyer (1990) and others, scientific research and the publication of research papers have become prominent and prioritized in the current climate of higher education, and this has significantly influenced how faculty members allocate their time (Diamond, 1993). Success for a faculty member is largely based upon one's productivity in scientific research and text-based publications, with a much smaller percentage of weight being allocated to performance in teaching and service (Boyer, 1990). Since World War II, as science and technology increasingly have become identified with progress and national interest(s), supported by massive and expanding grant funds from governmental and private sources, scientific research as a model for faculty work began:

> to spread exponentially and to colonize the academy as a whole…teaching became less well rewarded, and service---which had been once a proud tradition of extending knowledge beyond the campus---came to mean little more than being a good citizen, lending a hand when committee work need to be done (Glassick, Huber and Maeroff, 1997, p. viii, p. 7).

During this time period the prime focus of faculty in higher education changed from teaching and service to basic scientific research, and "from student to professor, from the general to the specialized, and from loyalty to campus to fealty to profession" (Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff, 1997, p. 8). Therefore, it continues to be important to ask, what is the meaning of research and how do institutions of higher learning define what constitutes research inquiry?

The conventional notion of research connotes an endeavor in which scholars "intentionally set out to enhance their understanding of a phenomenon and expect to communicate what they discover" (Leedy and Ormrod, 2005, p. 4). The traditional and conventional understanding is that "research must a) enhance the scientific community's

understanding of a phenomenon, or contribute to the body of knowledge, and b) research must communicate what was discovered in the new study to the scientific community" (Levy and Ellis, 2006). Research and research inquiry---in both qualitative and in quantitative contexts---have long been focused upon positivism and the discovery of empirical truth. Truth has been defined, according to this empiricist-positivist epistemological perspective, as "the accurate representation of an independently existing reality" (Smith and Hodkinson, 2000, p. 412-413). Empiricism, drawing upon an Aristotelian philosophical perspective, is a theory of knowledge that claims its representations to be true, objective and accurate. Empiricism suggests that "objects and phenomena have essence or identity: they are things in their own right…also, essential phenomena are free from contradiction---they are either one thing or another" (Bleakley, 2004). The search for empirical truth is accomplished through the application of proper (recognized and accepted) procedural methods that presumably enable the knower to accurately and objectively convey a description of reality.

Positivism, as evidenced in quantitative and qualitative scientific research, perceives "a reality out there to be studied, captured and understood," and is an approach that prioritizes the isolation, measurement and quantification of phenomenon, to allow for the verification and generalization of findings (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000 p. 14). From the positivist-empiricist perspective, the senses are mere conduits that allow for the entry of knowledge and ideas. As discussed in Chapter 4, aspects of positivistic-empirical methods of inquiry are consistent with the approach, scope and nature of artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in film and digital media. However, when compared with the "creative and interpretive" approach of qualitative research methods, including artistic and other creative works, the priorities and approach of positivist-empiricist, scientific, and quantitative research methods seem remote and

inferential, with the potential of silencing important voices that struggle to be heard (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000, p 16). Positivist values in qualitative research explicitly discourage ambiguity in the likeness of truth, and discourage any expressions of emotionality, personal responsibility; and de-emphasize an ethic of caring, praxis, multi-voiced perspectives, and creative dialogues (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000, p. 34). In academia, generally, scientism, positivism-empiricism and realist representations remain as the prevailing and dominant ontology, while the use of the personal/*self* as the primary source of data is skeptically considered to be (at best) a marginal alternative (Holt, 2003; Denzin and Lincoln, 2000).

Following Boyer (1990) in defining scholarship more broadly than the traditional view that emphasizes only discovery-based research inquiry, Braxton, Luckey and Helland (2002) describe the parameters of scholarship as a continuum (Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 2007, p. 90). One end of the continuum can be characterized by the traditional template, with the prioritization of scientific research, appearing in the form of publications in formal, peer-reviewed journals that are judged favorably or unfavorably as proper scholarship (Braxton, Luckey, and Helland, 2007; Richin, 2001). On the opposite end of the continuum, far away from the expectations of the traditional template, Braxton, Luckey and Helland (2007) place unspecified "scholarly activities", work that is performed by faculty members on a day-to-day basis, including activity that does not necessarily appear in text or other conventional forms at all (p. 90). Such work, action or performance "may be judged as scholarly if disciplinary knowledge and skill are used in performing this activity" (Braxton, Luckey, and Helland, 2007, p. 90).

The two extremes of the continuum as established by Braxton, Luckey, and Helland (2002), with the traditional template on one side and its comparable opposite, an alternative

view, on the other side, prompts a subsequent question: What is in the middle? Defining and describing the middle ground provides a useful referential context for deeper understanding of both extremes of the continuum. Braxton, Luckey, and Helland (2002) suggest that:

> Schulman and Hutching's view (1998) on the essential characteristics of scholarship hold middle ground on this continuum. They outline three such characteristics: the work must be public, amenable to peer review, and in a form that allows for exchange and use by members of the academic community (p. 90).

Braxton, Luckey, and Helland (2002) further suggest that "unpublished publicly observable outcomes of scholarly activity within the four domains of scholarship, if in an appropriate form for exchange and peer review," would meet the threshold for what constitutes the middle group of scholarship, but leave open the question of whether or not art and creative works, such as film and digital media productions, should be placed on the same continuum as conventional research scholarship. Most literature about faculty performance evaluation in higher education implicitly infers or implies that faculty scholars do not, should not or would not choose to deviate very far from expectations of the traditional and the conventional hierarchy in higher educational settings, and thereby makes implicitly discourages faculty scholars from the pursuit of artistic or other creative work as a form of scholarly work.

Advocacy for a more broad view of scholarship has been raised by many scholars, asserting the theoretical possibility that creative and alternative research output, including that which emerges in film and digital media, could possibly be *more comprehensive* in scope than conventional scholarship output, as it reaches beyond the domain of discovery to the domains of application, integration and/or public outreach/teaching (Boyer, 1990; Williams-Rautiola, 2001, Colbeck, 2006; Bukalski, 2000). Work in film and digital media can overtly demonstrate the

domains of application, teaching and integration---in addition to discovery. The idea that faculty work can discover, apply and/or integrate knowledge, ideally moving toward engagement with the public (audience), and that such research and output should be valued on its own particular and unique merits, not just on its adherence or resemblance to dominant, conventional requirements can be supported by Boyer and others (Boyer, 1990; Rice, 1988; Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff, 1997; NASAD, 1997; Bukalski, 1990). The idea that the sharing of knowledge through teaching, one of Boyer's four domains, including scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching, can be inherently creative activities has been supported by many others (Postman, 1971; Friere, 1997; Friere, 1998; Palmer, 2007; Cajete, 1994; Jacobs, 2008).

Consistent with Boyer (1990), and opposed to the conventional view that the trilogy of categories factory work are separated and distinct activities, Diamond (1993c) describes the nature of faculty work, with resonance and particular relevance to the work of faculty in the field of film and digital media, as a process of "interrelated efforts" and "interrelated activities" that involve aspects of discovery, application, integration and the sharing of knowledge through teaching (p. 2). However, it is possible that interpretive preconceptions, biases, and other skewed attitudinal perceptions about the scholar's or artist's work, personal values, approach, qualities and other characteristics can become ambiguously merged with the evaluator's expectations and judgments about faculty work and its degree of creativity, originality and scholarship---possibly explaining in part why faculty work in the field of film and digital media, and in many other fields and disciplines, can remain unrecognized as scholarly work, or least (or at best?) not allowed to pass without some controversy, debate or other form of resistance (Holt, 2003).

A critical approach to the reading of historical and theoretical literature has deepened my awareness of the significant shift in faculty and institutional priorities over time until the present day, characterized by a singular emphasis upon scientific research that is discontinuous with the trajectory of history in American higher education (Boyer, 1990; Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). Further, I recognize that the approach of qualitative research inquiry has historical, antecedent origins, not formed without precedent or in isolation from other approaches (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000; Vidich and Lyman, 2000). Establishing an historical framework about research inquiry, scholarly work, scholarship and other related ways of knowing and doing by faculty is assuring and helpful as I move to define what should be recognized during a review of faculty performance; and as I try to build a broad and relevant body of knowledge that facilitates my ability to position myself and my scholarly efforts as I write in a scholarly and personalized way.

Part 3: Characteristics of a performance evaluation system in higher education

Part 3 is divided into four sections:

1) Determining the worth and merit of faculty work
2) Comparing the process of evaluation in student work and faculty work
3) Intrinsic motivation and the process of evaluation
4) A qualified committee

1) Determining the worth and merit of faculty work

It has been important and useful in previous sections of this chapter and throughout this dissertation to build a more inclusive meaning and informed understanding of what has constituted scholarship and scholarly activity by faculty over time; but the real issue ultimately revolves around how to fairly and meaningfully evaluate, assess, and reward new, alternative and innovative forms of scholarship and scholarly work in the future. The fractured history of qualitative and quantitative research (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000), a legacy of conflicting priorities, paradigms, strategies, and methods has reified into a narrow, problematic, irrelevant and ambiguous set of criteria---a traditional template----that has little relevance to the research products that emerge from faculty work in the field of film and digital media (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). By narrowly defining and evaluating the scope and nature of research and its output under one umbrella, a one size fits all paradigm that has become skewed toward scientism and away from *self*, only serves to perpetuate the marginalization of alternative qualitative approaches to research inquiry such as the work by faculty in film and digital media, auto/ethnographic writing, and other approaches and works in fine arts---to mention only a few of us at the borders.

The argument that the products of faculty scholarship in teaching, research and service can emerge from more than positivist, quantitative, and discovery-based ontology that prioritizes

science and the scientific method, and can appear in different forms than just published monographs or refereed articles that report on discovery-based inquiries, has been advanced by Boyer and others (Boyer, 1990; Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff, 1997; Bukalski, 1990; Braxton, Luckey, and Helland, 2002; Collins, 2007; Four Arrows, 2008; Diamond, 1993, 1995; 1999). As described in the previous section, Boyer (1990) has been of significant help in broadening perceptions of scholarship and research, advocating for reasonable and relevant criteria to be used in assessing faculty scholarship in the field of film and digital media. Boyer (1990) wrote: "The time has come…to step back and reflect on the variety of functions academics are expected to perform" (p. 2). Boyer (1997) wrote: "the scope of scholarship should, I feel, be expanded, but the real problem we face is assessment," within any of the domains other than discovery and in forms that are different from those mandated by the traditional template (p. 3). Boyer (1990) observes: "Good teaching is assumed, not rewarded…good teaching is expected, but it is often inadequately assessed. And the category of 'service,' while given token recognition by most colleges, is consistently underrated, too" (p. 28, 33).

Matusov and Hampel (2008) recognize that faculty colleagues will differ sharply about the processes, expectations and priorities of scholarship and its evaluation. Faculty might agree on the importance of high quality work, but they disagree on how to determine whether high quality has been achieved. The *procedural* model of Matusov and Hampel (2008) attempts to measure the caliber of scholarship by a set of specific criteria. Matusov and Hampel (2008) xzwrote: "some faculty members prefer what we call a 'procedural model,' others a judgment model" (p. 1), but they add and important observation:

> …it is impossible to evaluate most colleagues' work…too many specializations for any individual to determine accurately strong, weak, or mediocre research in the cases of all

> candidates. We might hazard an opinion, but when a colleague's future is on the line, everyone wants to set forth more than a guess. Is it not better to entrust the judgment of the quality of the candidate's scholarship to external reviewers who are experts in the field (p. 2)?

Matusov and Hampel (2008) assert that committee members do not need to decide on their own whether a candidate's work meets the official criteria and what these criteria mean for particular cases because well-crafted policies will do that. By prioritizing types of publications (for example, peer reviewed over non–peer reviewed), rating scholarly journals (for example, lower acceptance rates over higher rates), asking external reviewers to vote for or against promotion (and to justify the vote), and using other predetermined criteria to gauge the merits of the candidate's scholarship, the faculty committee avoids the need to decide for itself if the work is good enough to merit promotion (Matusov and Hampel, 2008). Faculty meetings with discussion of the pros and cons of the dossier "are unnecessary because the criteria are elaborated in clear and detailed language, the promotion and tenure process is objective, fair, impersonal, and readily defended should anyone grieve or sue" (Matusov and Hampel, 2008, p. 1).

The *judgment* model of Matusov and Hampel (2008), in stark contrast to their procedural model, obligates the faculty to discuss and evaluate the quality of the scholarship under review. Even if a promotion and tenure committee prepares a recommendation, each faculty member independently confirms or refutes the prior appraisal. Although external reviewers can provide very good assessments of the scholarship's quality and thus inform the department's decision, their judgments alone are not enough (Matusov and Hampel, 2008). Matusov and Hampel (2008) indicate there are several well-known reasons for caution, warning that some external reviewers

are too generous in their assessments in order to nurture their own field, especially when that field is small; and some external reviewers are too tough because they want to guard a field that is very competitive. Moreover, many candidates can nominate external reviewers who they know will send glowing letters (Matusov and Hampel, 2008).

Matusov and Hampel (2008) indicate their preference for the judgment model, but the two models, procedural and judgment, represent two positions or approaches to evaluation that differ significantly, but sharing important points of overlap. In the procedural model, the exercise of individual judgment is considered a flaw in the process of promotion and tenure practice, inviting arbitrariness; while in the judgment model such exercise is welcomed as constructive. In the procedural model, judgment is subordinated to rules, even if judgment was required in the past to create the procedures; in the judgment model, rules exist only to facilitate judgment. Matusov and Hampel (2008) add:

> Procedures, rules, and standards can work very well to evaluate recursive, well-defined, and stable cases and events. However, evaluating out-of-the-ordinary, ill-defined, and nonrecursive cases and events requires judgment. We argue that scholarship demanding originality, creativity, and innovation is exactly this kind of out-of-the-ordinary case (p. 3).

Chapter 5 concludes whether the judgment or the procedural model, or a combination of both, would be most effective for the evaluation of work in the field of film and digital media.

Echoing the judgment model of Matusov and Hampel (2008) and prioritizing inclusion of faculty members in the process of recognition and evaluation, the AAUP recommends that faculty members be given the opportunity to comment and respond to evaluations that emerge from the process, opening the healthy yet potentially thorny possibility for an appeals procedure

by which faculty may challenge decisions from the process of evaluation (Euben, 2005). To achieve the goal of an appeals process, and presumably to mitigate the risk of inherently inappropriate processes, Euben (2005) suggests that post-tenure-review policies should be developed and implemented by faculty members, and resources should be allocated to support the professional development of faculty under such policies. Euben (2005) also suggests and reminds that successful post-tenure-review policies should also reaffirm an institution's commitment to academic freedom, tenure, and due process and serves to educate participants, including department chairs and deans. Chapter 5 provides a conclusion about the recognition and evaluation of faculty work based upon a theoretical and ethical model that prioritizes inclusion of faculty in all aspects of the process of performance review, and a coherent process of appeal in the case of negative decisions.

There is no consensus view in the literature that exists on the procedural or the judgment model (Matusov and Hampel, 2008), or any other aspect of this topic. Conventional expectations for the output of faculty work in text form require that output (manuscripts) adhere to the guidelines for ethics and content of the American Psychological Association (APA, 2001). But, the APA (2001) criteria for evaluating the ethics and content of manuscripts are oriented toward quantitative and very conservative notions of qualitative research (Holt, 2003). For example, guidelines include: "Is the research question significant, and is the work original and important? Does the research design fully and unambiguously test the hypothesis? Is the research at an advanced enough stage to make the publication of results meaningful" (APA, 2001, p 9)? Advice and direction for evaluating qualitative output extends to assessment of the quality of analyses, trustworthiness, and evidence about the saturation of data. In other words, there are very detailed and thorough criteria that are explicitly expected to be satisfied when a

faculty scholar produces conventional forms of scholarship for evaluation in academic settings, but are these kinds of criteria appropriate or relevant for evaluating creative scholarship, such as faculty work in film and digital media?

Much of the literature about performance evaluation, prior to the 1980s, is quantitative in method and positivist in approach---searching for empirical truth, with a central focus on developing psychometrically accurate rating scales that quantify input-feedback data. This kind of research does not contribute significantly to remediation of the problems under review, nor does resonate with my personal sense and perception about the complex nature of faculty performance evaluation practices that are in use today in higher education. The quantitative data from the 1980s certainly does not console my aching sense that something has been going terribly wrong in the evaluation of faculty work in film and digital media. La Pelle (1997) writes: "Many studies on performance evaluation look only at the immediate effects…participants' satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and perceptions of objectivity rather than at its longer impact on performance, motivation, and development" (p. 4).

Quantitative measures of faculty work might eliminate much of the subjectivity that could creep into the actual process of evaluation---but it must be asked if the use of hard, cold quantitative solutions exacerbates ethical and practical concerns? Worthen and Sanders (1989) suggest that the success of a performance evaluation system entirely depends on a workplace climate that is ethical, conducive and supportive of self-determination, one that honors competence in individual performance within the group setting. Quantitative or not, what matters to Worthen and Sanders (1989) are the ethical concerns that underpin the workplace and process of evaluation. Worthen and Sanders (1989) have delineated the ethical and practical aspects relating to the role of evaluators in the performance evaluation process, and observe that

an ethical framework should guide the evaluator during an evaluation process. Worthen and Sanders (1989) list twelve areas of concern:

- Evaluators are interested in solving practical problems.
- Evaluation typically leads to decisions.
- Evaluation describes a particular thing in a unique context.
- Evaluation seeks to determine merit or worth.
- Evaluation is generally undertaken at the request of a client (question: who is the client, the university administration or faculty applicant?)
- Evaluation attempts to assess the value of a thing
- Evaluation focuses on phenomena that are specific to that time, place and context.
- Evaluation is judged by its accuracy, credibility, utility, feasibility and propriety (i.e. it is done legally and ethically, protecting the rights of the individuals involved).
- Evaluation is generally conducted for a well-defined audience or client group (university administration and a faculty applicant).
- Evaluation is typically time-bound, with specific times established up front for start-up, duration and completion.
- Evaluation, on the other hand, requires the use of a wide range of inquiry perspectives and techniques in order to answer specific questions or to address particular problems.
- Evaluators require an interdisciplinary education in order to be sensitive to the wide range of phenomena to which they must attend.

Additional ethical concerns about the performance evaluation process are discussed in Chapter 4, emerging from data collected through surveys and interviews with project participants.

Departing from the two-part model of Matusov and Hampel (2008), and as discussed in more detail in Chapter 4, Diamond (1993) provides a generalized structural framework for implementation in institutional tenure and reward systems, with four basic and essential attributes, aiming to facilitate fair and informed evaluation of faculty work:

- The first attribute of an assessment system for tenure and promotion is for it to correspond, be aligned and be compatible with the mission statement of the college or university (Diamond, 1993a; 1999). Diamond (1993a; 1999) advocates for the importance of a mission statement at departmental, college and university levels. Subsequently, a body of literature has been published that advocates for the importance of mission statements (Meacham, 2008; Diamond and Adam, 2000; Berger, 2008; Douglas and George, 2008).
- Assessment systems for tenure and promotion must be sensitive to the differences among academic disciplines (Diamond, 1993a; 1999). As discussed in Chapter 4 I have collected data about perceptions by faculty at colleges and universities in relation to the institutional sensitivity and response to differences in research output among different academic disciplines, on the basis of their submitted creative work(s) in film or digital media production. In this context, Diamond (1993a; 1999) recommends that each academic unit (department, college), not only the centralized upper administrative authority, should establish their own specific criteria for tenure and promotion, and the range of activities judged to be relevant and appropriate for rewards. Related to this issue, Diamond (1993a; 1999) argues that it is not appropriate for committee members from disparate disciplines to apply criteria and scholarship assessment procedures used in

their academic discipline to faculty candidates for tenure and promotion from other academic disciplines.

- Assessment systems must be perceived as appropriate, fair and workable *(*Diamond, 1993a; 1999).
- The assessment system must be sensitive to standards established by regional, state and disciplinary accreditation associations (Diamond, 1993a; 1999). Diamond (1993b) argues that a proactive approach by accreditation agencies to provide guidelines for the development of evaluation criteria is "a positive force in relating individual efforts to institutional priorities" (p.10-11).

Diamond (1993a; 1993b) argues that tenure and promotion systems have failed to exhibit the above-listed attributes. It is noteworthy that Diamond (1993b, 1995, 1999) has consistently used the term, *assessment*, rather than *evaluation*. By definition, as discussed in the opening pages of this section, these are two distinct terms, with worth, and to a lesser degree, merit, being the most common denominators. Chapter 4 illustrates the importance of a clear distinction and understanding being shared and known by all parties, in advance of the performance evaluation.

Beyond the prevailing trilogy and traditional template in higher education, several alternative models for the recognition and evaluation of scholarly work have been developed, although none are directly pertaining to the work of faculty in the field of film and digital media. Williams-Rautiola (2001) analyzes general yet important considerations for the evaluation process of creative work, all of which are relevant to the field of film and digital media, including blind peer-review, the value of dissemination, and suggestions for a candidate's dossier for evaluation. Williams-Rautiola (2001) has facilitated greater understanding of the intellectual foundation of creative work, but her paper is not a full analysis of the problem; but her brief

paper provides a specific and noteworthy context that has helped to frame a significant aspect of my own research. Bukalski's (2000) account, published and distributed by the University Film and Video Association (UFVA) is a useful overview that considers many important aspects that clarify the process of entire production process and what should be recognized and submitted as evidence of faculty scholarship in film and video, but his recommendations are not contextualized in terms of the historical resistance to change that is evidenced in conventional settings.

Casting my net a little wider net as I searched the literature, from a more general perspective, one not directly addressing the problem facing faculty in film and digital media but pertinent nonetheless, Diamond (1993) posits six criteria that relate specifically to the recognition of faculty work as scholarship that have been applied at institutions of higher learning in promotion and tenure evaluations:

- The faculty member's work exhibits and high level of discipline-based expertise
- The faculty member's work breaks new ground or is innovative
- The faculty member's work can be reviewed by peers
- The faculty member's work can be replicated or elaborated upon by others
- The faculty member's work can be documented
- The faculty member's work is significant or has impact

From another perspective, Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) offer six common-sense criteria to be used for defining and assessing the quality of scholarship in the four domains:

- Goals. The faculty member's research must demonstrate clear goals
- Preparation. The faculty member's research must demonstrate adequate preparation

- Methods. The faculty member's research must choose, apply and judiciously modify (when required) appropriate methods
- Results. The faculty member's research should be judged on the basis of its significant results
- Presentation. The faculty member's research is effective in its presentation
- Critique. The faculty member's research must involve reflective critique

In contrast, Schulman and Hutching (1998) have developed a model for defining the scope and nature of scholarship activity by faculty:

- The work must be public
- The work must be subject to peer review
- The work must be in a form that allows for exchange and use by members of the academic community.

The essential characteristics of a performance evaluation process and system as articulated by Diamond (1993a; 1999); Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997); and Schulman and Hutching (1998) are applicable to the recognition and evaluation of faculty work in the field of film and digital media, as described in the findings of Chapter 4 and the conclusion in Chapter 5. Although Chapter 5 details the conclusions of this study, it is clear that faculty work in the field of film and digital media can emerge from traditional and conventional methods, all six criteria by Schulman and Hutching (1998), all six by Diamond (1993a;), and all six by Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997). Each of these models and the points therein are reasonably relevant and applicable for defining and evaluating artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media. However, the data from participants who were surveyed for this

project (Chapter 4) has clarified that the six criteria set forth by Schulman and Hutching (1998), Diamond (1993) and Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) might not be all-inclusive or entirely sufficient for the specific purposes of performance evaluation of artistic, creative scholarly, and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media, and therefore might not the definitive indicators for achieving the ultimate purposes of this dissertation. There is great value and relevance in the criteria set forth by Diamond (1993), and in the criteria of Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997), particularly when placed in relation to creative research output in film and digital media, and I observe that some of the criteria by Diamond (1993) and Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) fit relatively well with Boyer's (1990) domains of scholarship (discovery, application, integration and teaching). This literature provides a strong challenge to the traditional template's mandate for only text-based publications. However, as described in Chapter 4, the data I have collected during my inquiry identifies important and additional points of concern and relevance that are particular to faculty scholarship in the field of film and digital media.

2) Comparing the process of evaluation in student work and faculty work

Consideration of literature pertaining to the evaluation by teachers of student work and learning facilitates my ability to compare connections that can be made with the evaluation of teacher work (and learning?) in higher education----why is faculty scholarship and professional work in higher education settings, specifically in the field of film and digital media, not given the same level of diligent consideration as is applied to student work(s)? Why is faculty work in film and digital media not evaluated or assessed with the same use of written, quantitative

measurement tools, and why is there an exclusive reliance upon subjective and unwritten criteria for this form of scholarship and professional work?

Analysis of literature pertaining to the evaluation of student work and learning by teachers has facilitated meaningful comparisons with evaluation of faculty performance and work in higher education. This literature sheds glaring light on the discrepancies in assessment or evaluation practices at K-12 and college student levels with standards applied in faculty performance evaluations (Airasian, 1979; Kubiszyn and Borich, 1993; Nitko, 1983). The discrepancy of student models in contrast to those models for performance evaluation of faculty highlights the ambiguous, unwritten or irrelevant criteria that are applied in higher education settings during the process of faculty performance evaluation. For example, outcomes based learning and assessment models are explicitly demanded in K-12 classes and in college classroom settings, yet outcomes-based assessment models are largely absent from performance evaluation criteria for faculty in film and digital media. Much effort is made to construct and use diagnostic tools for assessment of student learning and growth, yet the same level of effort is not made for the evaluation of faculty performance.

Drawing from literature about teaching and academic efficacy in the classroom, I find useful and comparable arguments for an effective, more useful and informed assessment process, where assessment involves a two-way communication system of feedback, and include alternative strategies such as observation, personal communication, and student performances, demonstrations and portfolios (Dorman, Fisher and Waldrip, 2006; Stiggins, 1994). Barksdale-Ladd and Thomas (2000) argue that the conceptualization of assessment is an important part of a student's work, encouraging teachers to use more than a measuring stick to assess learning, ultimately ensuring that assessment informs instruction to help teachers to improve their own

practice and understanding, while also facilitating greater learning for students (Barksdale-Ladd and Thomas, 2000; Dorman, Fisher and Waldrip, 2006). Paradoxically, as teachers are being bombarded with information, theories, admonitions and decisions about best practices and what should be done in the classroom regarding assessment of student performance, an overwhelming majority of administrative systems in higher education do not apply the same ideals, theories, and innovative thinking to existing processes for faculty performance evaluation. What might be deemed as good for the teacher and the student in the classroom is apparently not good or relevant for the assessment or evaluation of teacher/faculty work? The contradiction is indicative of the problem of evaluation that is facing faculty members. Administrative systems for evaluating faculty performance remain inconsistent, prescriptive, and upheld against a backdrop that excludes faculty from the assessment/evaluation process and discourage self-reflection, professional development and creativity.

Some argue that the evaluation process is improved and simplified by a more straightforward approach, using bibliometric indicators, because the greater the variety of measures and qualitative processes used to evaluate research, the greater the likelihood that a composite measure offers a reliable understanding of the knowledge produced (Lim, 2006). But, should the evaluation process be reduced to the impartial itemized tabulation of results on a scorecard or checklist, with objectivity valued over subjectivity, quantity valued over quality? If so, then to what extent does the process of faculty evaluation relate to the improvement of faculty performance in any category, if at all (Seldin, 2006)?

Wait and Hope (2009) present a number of typical student achievement goals and provide the kind of indicators or evidence that are available to evaluate these goals. These come from an April 1990 briefing paper of the Council of Arts Accrediting Associations of which NASAD is a

member. It is useful for academic administrators and faculty to understand the notion of reciprocity---what is good for students should also be good for faculty---in the context of evaluation of work. I provide Wait and Hope's (2009) list to illustrate what they have indicated that might be missing and/or useful in the process of performance evaluation of faculty work.

Student Achievement Goals – Indicators/ Evidence Analysis

Competence in basic arts techniques

• Entrance, continuation and graduation requirements

• Achievement tests

• Course evaluations

• Class or laboratory examinations

Basic understanding of the history of the art form in Western and other civilizations

• Course requirements

• Syllabus content

• Class examinations

Basic general education at the college level, including the ability to understand distinctions and commonalities regarding work in artistic, scientific, and humanistic domains

• Transcript analysis

• Curricular requirements

• Syllabus review

• Achievement tests

• Class and laboratory examinations

Entry-level competence in the major field of study

- Juried examinations
- Placement records

Ability to enter graduate study in the major field

- Graduate school acceptances
- Records of completion of graduate work

A coherent set of artistic/intellectual goals evident in each student's work and the ability to achieve these goals as an independent professional

- Assessment of student projects
- Content of final projects
- Faculty and peer assessment of final projects

Ability to form and defend defined judgments

- Project assessments
- Master class evaluations

Ability to communicate in spoken and written language

- Syllabus review
- Project assessments

Ability to communicate ideas in a specific art form in professional circumstances

- Internship reports
- Employee ratings of performance
- Employment records

As I have analyzed the research problem and question, it becomes clear that much of much of the principles and goals that are in place for student evaluation are relevant to faculty performance. The means to improve the quality evaluation of artistic, scholarly and professional activity in all

specializations of the arts, including the field of film and digital media, are in place but in need of change and improvement.

3) Intrinsic motivation and the process of evaluation

Published statements from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) suggest that evaluation systems are best directed toward constructive measures for improvement (Euben, 2005), and that taking some basic steps can reduce the likelihood of litigation. Based upon an assumption that organizations would logically want to cultivate a climate that continually motivates high-performing employees, Deming (1986) advocated that conventional processes of performance evaluation in organizations should be eliminated and "replaced with group unit or plant-level performance evaluations and noncompetitive developmental coaching for individuals oriented to improving skills, performance, teamwork and motivation" (La Pelle, 1997, p. 2). Franke (2000), drawing from a joint report by the AAUP, the American Council on Education, and United Educators writes:

> Some faculty members who have been denied tenure report that, after the decision, colleagues ostracized them. Others say they had the opposite experience, that colleagues expressed outrage about the injustice and strongly encouraged them to challenge the outcome. Most often, an approach of supporting the candidate in moving along with his or her career best serves everyone's interests. In shunning a candidate, colleagues may increase the individual's sense of hurt and failure. Common courtesies can reduce some of the sting of the experience. Assistance with locating another position also goes a long way toward helping the individual move beyond the tenure denial. On the other hand, encouraging someone to challenge the outcome may lure him or her into the expensive

and protracted form of martyrdom known as civil litigation (p. 5)

Franke (2000; 2001) suggests that after the institution has denied tenure to a candidate, help should be provided to assist the individual to move on with his or her career. Franke (2000) further recommends that the faculty member should seek advice from the AAUP staff who may give useful perspective to candidates that did not succeed in a performance evaluation for tenure, promotion, or other institutional benefit.

La Pelle (1997), in support of the work of Deming (1986), argues that "performance appraisal processes in organizations, rather than improving performance, teamwork, and motivation, sometimes have a harmful effect and serve to de-motivate high-performing and highly motivated individuals" (La Pelle, 1997, p. ii). La Pelle (1997) and Deming (1986) were relevant and inspirational at first reading, and in direct contrast to my decreasing levels of motivation and enthusiasm about my own job (as the promotion process turned into a quagmire of inconsistencies). Of particular relevance and interest to this dissertation is La Pelle's (1997) advocacy for cultivating an environment in organizations that is "thriving on evaluation" (in contrast to one where one striving for evaluation) with the goal of achieving a process that continually motivates high-performing employees (La Pelle, 1997, p. ii). Performance evaluation is a complex and multi-faceted process, one of the most frequently studied topics in organizational sciences for years, but the majority of research writing on this topic, particularly in the field of education, has not reflected this multi-faceted nature (La Pelle, 1997).

According to La Pelle (1997) motivation in the workplace, consistent improvement in work performance, and consistent commitment to the workplace by highly motivated persons (in this case, employees of an organization) is more likely to be enhanced by performance evaluation when the following conditions exist:

- The organization is at the beginning to middle of its life cycle
- The organization's purpose for evaluation approaches an ideal and the supervisor does not have any hidden agenda of his or her own
- The supervisor is perceived by the supervisee to be qualified to give specific behavioral feedback, has good communication and coaching skills, and is autonomy supportive
- The supervisor encourages collaborative work design and goal-setting
- The supervisor can adapt her or his supervision style to meet the situational needs of the supervisee
- The Supervisor provides ongoing, behaviorally specific evaluative feedback outside the context of a formal review process
- The performance evaluation is perceived to be an extension of ongoing feedback and a more personal time of reflection, celebration, career counseling, and discussion of new skill development and work challenges.

The second part of LaPelle's theory (1997) (Striving with Performance Evaluation) suggests that work motivation, performance, and commitment are more likely to be decreased by performance evaluation for highly motivated individuals when:

- The organization is experiencing the need to restructure significantly
- The organization does not have a consistent and endorsed management system
- The supervisor is not perceived by the supervisee to be qualified to give specific behavioral feedback or is not really the decision-maker
- The supervisor sets up the work so that it is not autonomy supportive or has unclear or unachievable goals

- The supervisor does not provide ongoing, behaviorally specific, competency-enhancing evaluative feedback outside the context of a formal review process
- The formal evaluation is perceived as impersonal, critical, or content-free or as entirely driven by issues related to monetary rewards.

4) A qualified committee

Data in Chapter 4 addresses the issue of committee membership and the qualification of evaluators when tasked to consider faculty activities outside of their specialized knowledge. In the literature, Diamond (1993; 1995; 1999) has addressed this question and has articulated his concerns about the qualification and composition of performance evaluation committees who are tasked work that is outside of their areas of expertise. Diamond (1993) argues that performance evaluation committee members and administrators should be more adequately familiarized with the unique and specific scope and nature of the work in film and digital media under evaluation, and entirely set aside all preconceived, reductive, and deterministic notions about scholarly research, faculty priorities, and faculty performance that prejudicially disallow artistic, scholarly and professional work in film and digital media from being considered, recognized and rewarded as forms of faculty scholarship (Bukalski, 2000; Diamond 1993, 1995, 1999).

Part 4: Recognition of work by faculty in the field of film and digital media

Part 4 is divided into four sections:

1) Faculty priorities within each domain are unique
2) Personal leadership
3) Creativity and faculty work in film and digital media
4) The non-teachable nature of creativity and art

As described in earlier sections of this chapter, there are a plethora of prescriptive and proscriptive solutions that address the question of evaluation in general terms, but scant few are directly addressing the specific problems that relate to the recognition and evaluation of faculty work in film and digital media. Those faculty who are doing artistic works in film and digital media, or those producing written works that are personalized or auto/ethnographic in approach, are guided by inherently different motivations and self-directed criteria than peers aligned with conventional and traditional methods, and therefore should be recognized and evaluated with criteria that are relevant to the specific nature of the work itself rather than generic, one size fits all terms (Diamond, 1993, Diamond and Adam, 2000). Chapters 3 and 4 describe the broad scope and nature of faculty work in the field of film and digital media, arguing that it can be considered as reasonably consistent and consonant in many ways with conventional and traditional forms of scholarly work; and Chapter 5 argues that faculty work in film and digital media is unmistakably distinct from conventional forms as delineated by the traditional template because of its inherently personalized and expressive nature, in comparison with traditional and conventional forms.

1) Faculty priorities within each domain are unique

Remember that unique means 'one' (Jamison, 1984).

As I have proceeded over time to build a meaningful understanding of qualitative research and the panoramic range of scholarship activities by faculty members, I have been reminded that faculty priorities are unique within each disciplinary domain and field of knowledge (Diamond, 1993a; 1993b; Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 2007). What is common and expected within one discipline cannot necessarily or interchangeably be expected in another. Conventional notions about what constitutes research inquiry or its products are not relevant or applicable to the work of many faculty members in various fields of scholarship, including those in the field of film and digital media.

Diamond (1993) and others have argued that research and professional practices vary greatly from discipline to discipline, and the recognition of differences in scholarship must be considered (Lim, 2000; Bukalski, 2000). Scholarship in the field of film and digital media progresses from thoughtful (self-) reflection to the systematic effort of building knowledge and skills, to the developmental process of visualizing and realizing the creative idea through cinematography, scriptwriting and other means; to the creative and technical processes of editing where the raw materials get formed into a cohesive whole that gets disseminated as a completed work; to raising money for the work to be realized and of benefit to audiences and in any number of ways to the academic discipline (Bukalski, 2000). Unfortunately, understanding and sensitivity of nuanced differences from discipline to discipline is not in evidence in practice when faculty performance is evaluated and judged according to the guidelines of the traditional template. One size fits all is the norm in most cases of scholarship evaluation. An understanding

of the similarities and differences of creative research with conventional research must be reconciled with an acceptance that change and a plan for fair and proper assessment must emerge and be implemented so that all dimensions of academic work, not just to conventional forms of research, should be recognized, valued and rewarded by the academy (Boyer, 1990; Colbeck, 2006).

The uniqueness of artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in film and digital media outweighs its similarities with conventional and traditional expectations of faculty work, and this justifies the development of particular and relevant criteria for its recognition and evaluation in higher education settings. Tomasulo (2008) describes measurable (quantifiable) outcomes and results in the evaluation of work in film and digital media, as well as "the means by which to evaluate artistic qualities such as talent; beauty; and good screenwriting, cinematography, directing, acting, editing, sound and set design" (p. 115). Ultimately, according to Tomasulo (2008, p.116), the entire film faculty at Florida State reached agreement upon a 22-point criteria for measuring and assessing student works in film, including:

- Originality of premise
- Clarity of narrative
- Character development
- Dialogue
- Storytelling technique
- Shot design
- Acting performances
- Pacing
- Tone
- Shot composition
- Lighting
- Focus

- Editing for geography and space
- Conveying information
- Production design scheme
- Wardrobe, hair and makeup
- Set design
- Special effects
- Sound design
- Dialogue recording
- Music
- Sound mix (dialogue, music, sound effects)

Tomasulo (2008) provides an additional list of 54 learning outcomes by discipline, created by the faculty of the Florida State University film school (Appendix x). FSU developed 1.0-10.0 Likert scale that was used for evaluating each of the key areas of filmmaking, on the basis of the 22-point criteria above-listed (Tomasulo, 2008, p. 116). According to Tomasulo (2008), the benefits of establishing written criteria that are specific to work activities in film and digital media went beyond compliance with accreditation or other administrative concerns, and the use of quantitative data was found to be useful for students as they were given formative and summative feedback from the evaluation; plus quantitative data helped the department to identify, through low ratings, any deficient areas in need of improvement (or conversely, efficient areas through high ratings) within the departmental program such as teaching, facilities and others (Tomasulo, 2008).

On the negative side, Tomasulo (2008) acknowledges the risk of subjectivity in measuring works in film, and his ambivalence for "one size fits all measurements" such as the one adopted by his department (Tomasulo, 2008, p. 115). Aside from the obvious concern about

subjectivity as teacher-faculty evaluate and make a determination about grades based upon Tomosulo's (2008) template, I am concerned that Tomasulo's (2008) template for measuring student films seems to be solely applicable to narrative, dramatic filmmaking, with a possible lack of relevance to alternative approaches that faculty filmmakers might employ in documentary, ethnographic, artistic-experimental, industrial and other stylistic genres of creative scholarship and professional work.

For the sake of comparison, Richardson (2000, pp. 15-16) describes five factors that include analysis of both evaluative and constructive validity techniques that can be used when reviewing personal narrative papers, with relevance to the recognition and evaluation of faculty work in film and digital media. The five criteria are:

- Substantive contribution. Does the piece contribute to our understanding of social life?
- Authentic merit. Does the piece succeed aesthetically? Is the text artistically shaped, satisfyingly complex, and not boring?
- Reflexivity. How did the author come to write this text? How has the author's subjectivity been both a producer and a productive of this text?
- Impactfulness. Does this piece affect me emotionally and/or intellectually? Does it generate new questions or move me to action?
- Expresses a reality. Does this text embody a fleshed out sense of live experience?

Richardson's (2002) criteria provide constructive guidance to evaluators and feedback to the faculty scholar, and are a contextual starting point for building an evaluative framework to be used for performance evaluation of artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in film and digital media.

In the context of ethnographic writing, but relevant to the artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media, Van Maanen (1988, p xi) lists four central elements that can be used to form an initial framework for describing and recognizing (and evaluating) whether or not a personalized approach in scholarly inquiry can be considered as a form of scholarly work:

- Is there an assumed relationship between culture and behavior (the observed)?
- Is there a reflection of experiences by the fieldworker (the observer)?
- Is there a representational style of writing that joins the observer and the observed (the tale)?
- Is the role of the reader engaged in the active reconstruction of the tale (the audience)?

Van Maanen (1988) argues that conventional demands and standards for the reliability and validity of conventional ethnographies are overrated, unreliable, and misleading---and the same argument can be made in reference to work in the field of film and digital media. Although Van Maanen (1988) argues for the importance of theoretical and domain specialization of the sort that presupposes historical knowledge, linguistic competence, and deep personal experience, he also argues that significant priority should be focused upon jargon-free readability, authenticity, verisimilitude, and a very high level of cultural expertise and sophistication. The same argument can be made in reference to work in the field of film and digital media. Van Maanen (1988) justifies his argument(s) about readability, accessibility and the rest by writing: “since those who read ethnography for pleasure and general knowledge are as able to judge whether they (the combined goals of readability and specialized knowledge) are achieved as those who read for professional development” (p. 33). The same observation can apply in the field of film and

digital media because audience members who view, appreciate and perhaps evaluate a work in film or digital media may or may not be professional practitioners.

Bukalski (2000) introduces the problems of evaluating creative activity by faculty in film and digital media, but there are no theoretical connections that are established with Boyer (1990), nor with other theoretical arguments for institutional change. As described in Chapter 4, there is a large majority of faculty in the field of film and digital media that are not familiarized with the theoretical groundwork of Boyer (1990) and others (Rice, 1988), and this dissertation is an attempt to integrate their theoretical perspectives with the practical work of Bukalski (1990). Bukalski (1990) does provide a very useful framework for systematically understanding how a film is developed, produced and disseminated, and this approach has greatly influenced my in depth analysis in search of a theoretical solution to the problem posed in Chapter 4 and in the recommendations of Chapter 5 of this dissertation.

2) Personal leadership

Although the work of making a film or digital media project is collaborative, the notion of personal leadership is fundamental to filmmaking. In creative scholarship and professional work by filmmakers, as in action research, the work is collaborative, though it is important to realize that the action research of a group is achieved through the critically examined action of the individual group members (Kemmis and McTaggart, 1982). Filmmakers work in teams or crews, under the direction of a client, producer, or other sole person with creative, technical or financial powers or control; but the final responsibility for the realization of any detail of work throughout the process rests with the individual who is doing a particular task. Borrowing from

theoretical literature about leadership, and applying it to the experience of being a filmmaker, Gemmill and Oakley (2001) write:

> While leadership is viewed as a having a positive connotation, we suggest that contrariwise it is a serious sign of social pathology, that it is a special case of an iatrogenic (as in a disease that is induced by the treatment) social myth that induces massive learned helplessness among members of a social system. As social despair and helplessness deepen, the search and wish for a messiah (leader) or magical rescue (leadership) also begins to accelerate. We argue that the current popular writings and theories of leadership clearly reflect this social trend" (Gemmill and Oakley, 2001, p. 273).

Gemmill and Oakley (2001) remind me that the process of filmmaking is a lonesome highway where the buck stops with me (the filmmaker), and of the palpable connection between practice, pain and learning; a distinct practical and theoretical relationship between personal responsibility, personal leadership and self-empowerment. Gemmill and Oakley (2001) continue:

> When pain is coupled with an inordinate, widespread, and pervasive sense of helplessness, social myths about the need emerges for great leaders and magical leadership, from the primarily unconscious collective feeling that it would take a miracle or messiah to alleviate or ameliorate this painful form of existence (Gemmill and Oakley, 2001, p. 273).

Chapter 4 provides a detailed discussion about the process of work in the field of film and digital media, demonstrating that the collaborative nature of the filmmaking practice is actually reliant upon a creative, technical, business and legal meeting of minds by self-reliant individuals.

Chapter 5 proposes a theoretical model for recognizing and evaluating the scope and nature of work by faculty in the field of film and digital media, considering the approach, unique values and processes, and the results of the work.

3) Creativity and faculty work in film and digital media

As discussed in Chapter 1, creativity is an important thematic aspect that underpins a discussion of alternatives to the traditional and conventional paradigm of expectations about faculty work, and in characterizing faculty work in the field of film and digital media. An overview of the relevant literature and program activity pertaining to creativity consists, at least in the English-language, of at least the following sources:

- There are two major journals devoted exclusively to creativity research and theory (Creativity Research Journal and Journal of Creative Behavior).
- There are many other psychological and educational journals that provide reports about creativity research as a major component of each issue (e.g. Empirical Studies of the Arts; Imagination, Cognition, and Personality; Metaphor and Symbolic Activity; Gifted Child Quarterly; Roeper Review).
- Many journals not primarily devoted to creativity research frequently include reports of creativity research (e.g. Review of General Psychology; American Psychologist; Journal of Personality and Social Psychology).
- There is a division of the American Psychological Association devoted to creativity (Division 10, Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity and the Arts) that also publishes a journal that features creativity research, the Bulletin of Psychology and the Arts.
- There are scores upon scores of books about creativity, including theoretical research about creativity (Csikzmentmihalyi, 1975; 1990; 1997), that are published in English each year, and in many other languages, from a multitude of perspectives---business, leadership, arts and design, personal development, psychology, education in the classroom, and many more.

- Creativity research is a major topic at many psychology and education conferences every year, and in professional development contexts for businesspersons, organizational leaders and other contexts.

An analysis of what is creativity and what is creative research, in contrast to conventional research and expectations, is another important aspect of this dissertation. There are many nuances and personal differences in the varied definitions and descriptions of creativity. Generally, there are two concepts that frame our common understanding about creativity (Sawyer, 2006), including:

- *Originality,* something (an idea or thing) that has not been done before. The creative idea or thing should not be an obvious extension of something that already exists.
- *Functionality,* something (an idea or thing) that "has to work, or be adaptive or be functional in some way or for some purpose…it has to meet some general criteria of usefulness" (http://www.apa.org/monitor/nov03/creativity.html).

A range of literature about creativity emphasizes the importance of unique insight, relating or combining seemingly remote, contradictory or irrational ideas in recognizable and useful ways. The creative idea and its outcome must be different but also have value and be useful (Gorkin, 1985). In the USA, the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD, 1997) has articulated its philosophy concerning art and design as a profession, indicating an integrative definition where utility and purpose, learning, practice and theory converge with individual giftedness: "Talent without skills, inspiration without knowledge, and creativity without technique can account for little but lost potential" (NASAD, 2010, p. 1). The

emphasis upon skills is a significant distinction that characterizes creative research in film, digital media production (and other forms of artistic practice too) in comparison with conventional scholarly research output that appears in text form.

Creativity is also commonly described as more than an incidental activity that is done on occasion (Sawyer, 2006). To create is a way of thinking, a mental, emotional and behavioral process that is a fundamental drive, forming shape and building to fruition in the heart and mind of the creative person (Durant, 1961). Some theorists have indicated that artistic expression is minimally or rarely creative at all because most artists are consistently working within a certain stylistic allegiances (Elkins, 2001), and for something to be literally considered creative it should not be imitative or replicating of what has been done before (de Bono, 1990). On the other hand, all one has to do is observe a painter while at work, doing each individual brush stroke in a specific and unique manner toward some end known only to the artist; or a composer selecting a sequence or cluster of notes to achieve a certain melody or harmony; an actor using Stanislavski's (1936/1988; 1938/2008; 1961; 1963) teachings for sense memory in the moment of character portrayal; or a skilled cinematographer or director that frames the camera to create a shot from imagination, and one knows that something special is happening, and that special something is usually called creativity. Art and creativity have long been held as synonymous in common parlance because both are primarily concerned with the invention of something that is new and different, and each brush stroke, each musical note or chord, each contour of line has a uniqueness unto its own.

Art has been considered as an alternative avenue of knowing and learning, an integral part of natural philosophy and necessary context for receiving, remembering, and valuing everyday living. Creative writing, fiction or non-fiction, would not be recognized as scholarship

either, at least not according to this extreme position. Generating creativity and the impulse to make art of any kind starts as a way of thinking, a mental, emotional and behavioral process that emerges from a fundamental drive, perhaps primordial in origin, leading to action that forms, shapes and builds, bringing the creative and the artistic to fruition from the heart and mind of the creative person to the empirical domain. Durant (1961) writes:

> Everything in the world is moved by an inner urge to become something greater than it is. From the perspective of Aristotelian objectivity, every thing has a form and that form has grown out from raw material called 'matter.' In time, the form that emerged from matter may in turn become the matter out of which still higher forms will grow (p. 80).

The transformation of matter to form is a constant process of actuality over potential. As matter can be formed and shaped into a work of art, so can filmmaking and the art of filmmaking be viewed as an expression of understanding. Art, in its broadest context, could signify all norms of creative expression, including film/video making, plus many other forms such as writing, painting, sculpture, musicianship, dance and movement, photography, calligraphy, and more, to name just a few well-recognized areas.

Fritz (1994) observed that the most important developments in civilization have come through the creative process, but ironically, most people have not been taught to be creative. While I must agree that the creative process has certainly been the catalyst in human development throughout history, is the reason that most people have not been taught to be creative the result of its impossibility---that it is impossible to teach or evaluate creativity? Is creativity the mysterious, unattainable gift of genius that has been held throughout time, or can it be reduced to teachable skills? Is creativity's absence, as argued by Fritz (1994), the result of insufficient understanding about what is creativity, as a skill that can be learned, a skill and

knowledge-area that has been wrongly and generally neglected and underestimated in schools? Perhaps, can the ambiguity, difficulty or impossibility of *teaching* art (Elkins, 2001) explain the absence of fair and reasonable criterion for *evaluating* art, specifically the artistic, scholarly and professional work of faculty in the field of film and digital media?

From the theoretical perspectives of quantum physics and chaos theory, supported by nature itself, it is postulated that randomness and unpredictability are inherent, and that change is perpetual, constant, inevitable and infinite (Capra, 1996; Wheatley, 1992). In nature, it is not clear that change for the sake of change constitutes creativity or a creative action because there is no end point or finality, thus no clear function or reference for determining *originality* (Kaplan, 1966). Nature is adaptive and change seems to come about through fortuitous happenings and processes; so it is not clear that change in nature is creative at all, unless I assume a teleological perspective and consider our world to be the creative handiwork of a Creator. For example, water in the liquid state is not the same as water in the frozen state or the gaseous state. There is a logical explanation, the temperature changes so the water transforms to ice, but is this a creative response? At some point, the water experienced a transition, a change, and an observable difference. Change in the context of such difference is the contrary of equality or sameness, particularly with objects. Such differences "can only be stated on the basis of a comparison or categorization, and since a complete comparison of objects or things is seldom possible in practice, only relevant or defining attributes are used for stating equality or difference" (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Difference). In this case, the comparables are the landmarks of water, ice and gas. Similar or different objects are only similar or different "with respect to attributes of discriminative value" (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Difference).

Human creativity and the process of creative expression in any medium, including film or

digital media, is presumed to emerge from intentionality. It is considered to be a conscious, strategic action. Human creativity is different from the rest of the natural world's creativity, although human creativity arguably shares many dynamics with natural creativity in the context of change (De Bono, 1990; 1992). Inherent lack of understanding about the question of what is creativity, and what is the relationship of creativity to conventional and alternative understanding of scholarship and professional work in film and digital media, are inherently important areas in inquiry in my dissertation as I try to establish the relevance of creativity in the context of the traditional template---but it is a continuous process of reflection and possibly an unanswerable and limitless question.

4) The non-teachable nature of creativity and art

A connection between what can be taught and what can be evaluated has been established by Elkins (2001). Elkins (2001) argues the possibility that art cannot be taught and therefore are potentially not possible for evaluation. Rand (1990) supports the non-teachable nature of fine arts by stating: "…I am inclined to say that fiction writing---and the fine arts in general---cannot be taught. Much of the technical skill involved can be, but not the essence" **(**p. 2;). Elkins (2001) wrote: "There have long been doubts about whether art can be taught, going back at least to Plato's concept of inspiration, mania and Aristotle's concepts of genius and poetic rapture" (p. 95).

In Greek philosophy, a distinction was made between subjects that could be taught and subjects that could not (Elkins, 2001). Whatever could be taught had a theory, or a body of information, a set of methods, or something that could be written down and handed on to students. Such subjects were called "techne", and for the Greeks they included arts, crafts, and sciences. Other subjects could not be taught. Instead they had to be absorbed, or learned by example (Elkins, 2001 p. 105). Aristotle called them emperia: "…what we think of as art (today) is more like emperia, it does not depend on rules so much as on nonverbal learning, things that can not be put into words" (Elkins, 2001, p. 105). Elkins (2001) further identifies the Romantic art schools as claiming that art is not teachable because individual inspiration is central in art. From Elkins' (2001) point of view, before it can be said that art can be taught, one important shift is for a rethink of the role of technique is in fine arts, because it is impossible to separate art from technique---despite the common assumption that technique is ultimately separate from art. Elkins (2001) also argues that the teaching of art, at least in the classical sense is not teachable because:

> we do not know how we teach art, and so we cannot claim to teach it or to know what teaching it might be like…Art schools would be very different places if teachers and students did not continue to hold onto the idea that there is such a thing as teaching art, even when they don't believe in it securely, or analyze it directly. That puts art departments and our art schools in a self-contradictory position (Elkins, 2001, p. 91-92).

Elkins (2001, p. 107-110) provides some "individual claims" that clarify his views that art is not teachable:

- The idea of teaching art is irreparably irrational. We do not teach because we do not know when or how we teach.
- The project of teaching art is confused because we behave as if we were doing something more than teaching technique.
- It does not make sense to propose fundamental changes in the ways art is taught (because you can't fix something irrational by trying to rationalize it).
- Art can be taught, but it seems as if it can't be since so few students become outstanding artists
- Art cannot be taught, but it can be fostered or helped along
- Art cannot be taught or even nourished, but is possible to teach right up to the beginnings of art, so that students are ready to make art the moment they graduate
- Great art cannot be taught, but run of the mill art can
- Art cannot be taught, but neither can anything else

Elkins (2001) openly acknowledges the high degree of skepticism and pessimism in his analysis, but does not waiver in his conclusion that it is pointless and futile to believe that we can teach art in our modern world. The same question(s) can be raised about filmmaking, namely, for example, what is filmmaking and what are the best ways to teach and empower learning, creativity and competence in filmmaking? With support from Plato, Aristotle, Rand, Elkins, and many more, it is arguable that filmmaking, like art in general, is not teachable because most teachers have no clear idea, beyond technical skills building and demonstrated memorization of facts and steps in processes, how filmmaking is best taught.

Part 5: Change in institutions of higher learning

Part 5 is divided into four parts:

1) Challenges and obstacles
2) Institutional change
3) The need for change
4) Court decisions relating to faculty

1) Challenges and obstacles

What does change in the practices and policies for recognizing and evaluating work by faculty in film and digital media at institutions of higher learning entail? Times are a'changin' and change is in the air. Boyer (1990) wrote: "It is time to end the suffocating practice in which colleges and universities measure themselves" (p. xiii). Change refers to the transition that occurs from sameness to difference. For example, water in the liquid state is not the same as water in the frozen state; thus, the water experienced a transition from sameness to difference. An alternative view or strategy about change in organizations or institutions, change that benefits those of us at the borders, is not easily or overtly found in the literature, nor is it easily accomplished in traditional and conventional university settings. Scholarly inquiry about change has not overtly examined the issue of (non-) recognition and (unfair) evaluation of faculty work in the field of film and digital media. Therefore, change can only be advocated from bits and pieces that have emerged, directly or indirectly. The process of inquiry has led to an untested theory that is emerging from the integration of data that I have collected; and change will only be determined through comparison of characteristics that determine the relative sameness or difference over time.

2) Institutional change

Institutionalization of Boyer's four domains is an important theme in a range of literature relating to *change* in the ways that the evaluation of research by faculty occurs. Braxton, Luckey and Helland (2002) and Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) emphasize the importance of achieving institutionalization of Boyer's four domains, advocating institutionalization on three levels: structural, procedural, and incorporation. To achieve institutionalization of the four domains, the criteria for defining and rewarding scholarship should match Boyer's formulations, and should be consistent with the institution's mission statement (Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 2002). The guiding definition of institutionalization as used by Braxton, Luckey and Helland (2002), based upon Clark (1971, P. 75) is:

> …institutionalization, more broadly conceived, is the process whereby specific cultural elements or cultural objects are adopted by actors in a social system…to the point at which an innovative practice loses its special project status and become part of the routine behavior of the system (p. 5).

Scholars that advocate institutionalization of Boyer's four domains unanimously agree that lasting change entirely depends on innovation becomes institutionalized (Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 2002). Braxton, Luckey and Helland (2002) identify many factors about the traditional research template that impede institutionalization of Boyer's four domains, including: prevailing processes used to discourage innovative approaches to research, the imposition of irrelevant criteria to assess creative or alternative forms of scholarship by faculty, and the failure of institutional processes to acknowledge the forms and domains of scholarship other than discovery (Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 2002).

Diamond (1993c) writes: “In order for institutional change to be successful, those directing the process must have a plan that develops ownership in the final system by everyone who will be involved in or affected by its implementation” (p. 3). But how is paradigmatic change to be achieved? According to Diamond (1993c), change in the processes for recognizing and evaluating faculty work in the field of film and digital media involves five basic steps:

- Development of an institutional mission statement
- Development of departmental and divisional mission statements in concert with the institutional statement.
- Development of departmental and divisional promotion and tenure guidelines and procedures based on the goals in those mission statements.
- Institutional review and approval of both mission statements and the faculty reward guidelines.
- Change requires a commitment from all participants in the process, but most institutions of higher learning continue to be structured hierarchically, like a pyramid.

The locus of power is concentrated and held by a few at the top point, supported by lesser levels of power in the ranks of followership as the pyramid descends downward toward the base.

Diamond (1993c) lists three recommendations as a framework for change:

- Re-conceptualization of faculty priorities requires a genuine commitment to change.
- The entire academic community must be actively involved in the change process.
- The difficulty of the process of changing promotion and tenure criteria will vary across academic areas and faculty.

It is essential, as explained in Chapter 5, that administrators take full responsibility for providing the guidelines, general procedures, and defining the roles and time line that frame the

process (Diamond, 1993c). It also must also be noted that nothing from the top will change unless everyone from top to bottom buy into the change. Any modification that is anticipated in an institutional system for performance evaluation of faculty work should be clearly articulated and understood by all participants in the process---administrators, committee members and faculty applicants.

3) The need for change

Boyer (1990) has opened up an alternative paradigm for defining faculty scholarship, one that ultimately allows for the prioritization and recognition of artistic, scholarly and professional work in film, digital media, and in many other academic fields (Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 2007; Glassick, Huber and Maeroff, 1997; Diamond, 1993; Diamond, 1999; Lincoln and Guba, 1985). The contribution of Boyer (1990) and others (Rice, 1988; 1995) have facilitated a higher level of respect and status for the full range of faculty work and activities relating to the trilogy of teaching, research and service, and has compelled higher education to demonstrate the imagination and creativity to support and reward both scholars uniquely gifted in performing the processes of (conventional and unconventional) research, and those who excel in other uses of knowledge (Glassick, Huber and Maeroff, 1997). Boyer (1990) has developed a panoramic, socially involved and socially responsible view for institutional and community-based service, and a meaningful model that equally values and prioritizes the full range of scholarship of activities that are performed by faculty members. However, change is needed and should not be assumed.

As institutions of higher learning have "grown more and more complex, the disciplines have become increasingly divided, and academic departments frequently are disconnected from

one another…evidence abounds that many professors are ambivalent about their roles" (Boyer, 1990, p. 2). The result has been that some, perhaps many, faculty members (including myself) suffer from a lack of intrinsic motivation in the workplace because conflicting priorities "demoralizes the professoriate, erodes the vitality of the institution, and cannot help but have a negative impact on students" (Boyer, 1990, p. 2-3). Intrinsic motivation, and the underlying human need for competence and self-determination, cannot be realized in a negative environment of conflicting priorities (La Pelle, 1997; Deci and Ryan, 1985).

As I began my search of literature, I was unable to define the plethora of problems that face faculty members that enter the seemingly simple process of applying for a promotion of academic rank on the basis of artistic, scholarly or professional work in film and digital media. I intuited problems through my own personal experience, but after reading a range of literature about the process of academic performance evaluation I became more able to systematically understand the scope and nature of the problem situation. Inconsistencies and ambiguities became apparent in my own workplace as performance evaluation processes were being conducted without written criteria pertaining to work by faculty in film and digital media, and the depth of the problem was affirmed in the literature that I was beginning to find and read. The first scholarly writing that I was fortunate to read, found luckily through a random search of the Fielding database of doctoral dissertations that used grounded theory methods (Glaser, 1976), was a doctoral dissertation written by La Pelle (1997). La Pelle (1997) provides a useful description about a lack of intrinsic motivation that can occur as the result of a performance evaluation:

> When people are intrinsically motivated, they will be involved in an ongoing cyclical process of seeking out or creating optimally challenging situations and then attempting to

> conquer those situations. They will direct their attention to those activities that require them to learn or stretch their abilities a small amount. Activities that are too challenging or too easy/boring will be abandoned. An intrinsically motivated activity is one that would be undertaken without any apparent external reward, where the reward is said to be in the activity itself (p. 10).

Recognizing the significance of intrinsically motivated work, in contrast to and distinct from extrinsically motivated work, magnifies the most important purpose of this dissertation---developing a model (in Chapter 5) for performance evaluation that can increase personal satisfaction and intrinsic motivation; and reinforce the perception that individuals and groups have control over their self and their actions.

What will happen if change is not forthcoming, or if faculty succumb (or are forced to succumb) and thus abandon the principles the possibilities offered by change? Wait and Hope (2009) offer five probable results for faculty in the arts based on observations of what has already been happening, and what potentially will be the long-term results:

> First, we will be placed in an evaluation environment that is alien to the pursuit of our particular goals, an environment that attacks any attempt to solidify the validity of our goals.
>
> Second, our precious time will be requisitioned for purposes not consistent with the nature of our work. Because time is a finite resource, our ability to be productive in our fields is lessened.
>
> Third, the illusion has already been created and will be furthered that assessment requires no expertise in the thing being assessed, but only expertise in assessment. A way-station to this goal is the splintering of wholes into parts and then focusing on the parts that are easy

> to evaluate in a technical way and magnifying them to obscure or deny the existence of the whole.
>
> Fourth, these three results will lead to a loss of control in curriculum, teaching, individual approaches, and evaluation. Control passes from the field to external, usually centralized bodies that make judgments on the basis of images created by numbers, rather than real achievement in the discipline.
>
> Finally, an abandonment of our principles and ways of working will reduce our productivity as our time and energy are spent either fighting for the working room we need to be productive, or answering assessment requirements that are not based on the nature of what we do (p. 10-11).

4) Court decisions relating to faculty

Litigation and decisions that emerge in courts of law are potentially powerful facilitators of change. There is a changing legal landscape as society, including faculty, becomes more litigious. There are laws, legal protections and court decisions that are applicable to faculty, colleges and universities that are related to the inquiry of this dissertation. In theory, institutional change can emerge from conflicts that are resolved through litigation in the court. Conflicts and litigation emerge from disagreements about the (mis-) application of institutional processes, rules and regulations; from alleged breaches of oral or written contractual agreements pertaining to faculty appointment and contractual renewal (or tenure), from perceived irregular deviations from academic customs, from disagreements about the merits of a rendered decision, and (where applicable) from disputes arising from collective bargaining agreements. In an effort to determine the extent that faculty have found relief from their conflicts through legal litigation in

courts of law, I have searched legal briefs and other documents pertaining to court proceedings and disputes in law at the levels of the state and supreme court, to consider the scope and nature of judicial decisions concerning faculty in higher education.

Faculty in many fields have been terminated, professionally marginalized, or prejudiced in their academic workplace as a consequence of negative performance evaluations, and lawsuits have ensued (See Appendix M). Faculty members have sought remedy and relief, successfully and unsuccessfully, from the court in matters involving negative performance evaluations which have resulted in the denial of tenure, denial of promotion of rank, or a perceived breach of contract; lodging legal complaints on alleged violations of academic freedom, discrimination of the basis of gender/sex, and negative perceptions about collegiality (Fisher v. Vassar College, 852 F. Supp. 1193 (S.D.N.Y. 1994), rev'd, 6 F.3d 379 (2d Cir. 1995), aff'd, 114 F.3d 1332 (2d Cir. 1997) (en banc), cert. denied, 118 S. Ct. 851 (1998); Brown v. Trustees of Boston University, 891 F.2d 337 (1st Cir. 1989); Kunda v. Muhlenberg College, 621 F.2d 532 (2d Cir. 1980)).

Courts have long adhered to a rule that college and university tenure decisions are presumptively correct and entitled to deference. This is derived from the common-law rule of academic abstention protecting colleges and universities from judicial reconsideration of the merits of tenure decisions and from contemporary principles of institutional autonomy. It is a fundamental precept of American higher education law that courts should refrain from reviewing the merits of tenure and promotion decisions. There is a long history of case law and judicial opinions that support the doctrine of institutional autonomy, protecting the tenure and promotion processes of colleges and universities. The rule has been uniformly applied to insulate colleges

and universities from judicial reconsideration of the merits of faculty tenure and promotion decisions.

Byrne (1989) describes academic *absention* as: "the traditional refusal of courts to extend common law rules of liability to colleges where doing so would interfere with the college administration's good faith performance of its core functions." Such core functions include the decision whether to promote a faculty member in rank or to a tenured position. There are essentially two reasons that justify judicial deference:

- Tenure decisions involve complex, subjective assessments of scholarship—a task that courts are generally not equipped or willing to make.
- Institutional autonomy promotes academic freedom by insulating colleges and universities from the potential effects of external intrusion in the performance review process that are not necessarily related to the merits of particular case.

On three occasions the United States Supreme Court has explicitly endorsed the principle of academic abstention with respect to a university's core academic decision making---Board of Curators of the University of Missouri v. Horowitz, 435 U.S. 78 (1978), Regents of University of Michigan v. Ewing, 474 U.S. 214 (1985), and Grutter v. Bollinger, 539 U.S. 306, 328 (2003). The general rule is articulated in Keddie v. Pennsylvania State University, 412 F. Supp. 1264, 1270 (M.D. Pa. 1976):

> [A reviewing] court is powerless to substitute its judgment for that of the University as to whether plaintiff's academic credentials are such that tenure should have been awarded. The judiciary is not qualified to evaluate academic performance. The courts do not possess the expert knowledge or have the academic experience which should enlighten an

> academic committee's decision. The courts will not serve as a Super-Tenure Review Committee.

Over the last three decades, courts have consistently applied the doctrine of academic abstention and declined reconsideration of the merits of institutional tenure and promotion decisions. The historical context in which the courts' strong reluctance to intrude in tenure and promotion decisions have been consistently reflected the courts of the United States (p. 1270).

The most efficient way to find legal cases is through the fee-based data base service of Lexis/Nexis (www.lexisnexis.com), though it only highlights appellate cases. For jurisdictions in the United States, a free site for some legal information is FindLaw.com, and a google.com search can also be fruitful in locating basic information and linkages to additional resources. I also found excellent data bases of legal briefs and analytical writings about higher education law at the websites for the American Council on Education (www.acenet.edu/bookstore) and the American Association of University Professors (www.aaup.org). For my research to be comprehensive in scope, if I were examining the breadth of legal issues and court decisions pertaining to faculty performance evaluation in a particular state or nationally, I would also have to decide what jurisdictions are to be focused upon, and to look for cases that might not have necessarily been appealed or tried, neither of which did I find it necessary to do for this inquiry. Pure legal research sources are not likely to highlight professor vs. non-professor plaintiffs and college vs. non-college employers, so it would also be extremely difficult to locate such cases to determine relevance to this inquiry.

In order for a claim to proceed in a court of law it must be based upon a breach of expressed or implied contract, or upon some other form of unlawful employment practice (hostile environment, retaliation, wrongful termination, defamation; or upon a form of

discrimination that violates statutory or Constitutional protections. The latter would have to involve a protected class or characteristic under the Human Rights Act, Civil Rights Act, American with Disabilities Act (ADA); and involve claims such as discrimination on the basis of age, speech protections, disability, sexual preference, race, or religion.

I have read and reviewed at least twenty-five court decisions about faculty claims of wrongful termination, arbitrary dismissal, violations of constitutional protections, and other concerns that relate to performance evaluation in higher education. I have observed that in a large number of cases the faculty claim does not prevail, particularly at the appellate court level, probably because the threshold for proving discrimination that coincides with the claim of employment termination is extremely difficult to meet to the satisfaction of the court. Alleging that a decision to not-renew a contract or not award tenure is unfair or baseless is not enough to satisfy the court, there must also be a provable case of discrimination that coincides with the employment issue.

The emerging conclusion from my reading and review of legal cases, as further discussed in Chapter 4, is that an aggrieved faculty member in the academic field of film and digital media cannot expect change or to find solace or resolution in the court by filing a claim about disputed performance evaluation decisions or processes. The gauntlet of faculty performance evaluation is backed up by a litany of institutional rules upon rules, reinforced by local, state and federal labor laws and other legal protections that are enjoyed by an employer; with the case being argued by an army of lawyers who are on the university's payroll. Colleges and universities are protected by a long history of legal precedent for academic absentism, while faculty have few ways to overcome this legal and theoretical threshold. For a faculty to find relief in the court, opposing a university or college, would be (at best) a David v Goliath battle, one that is argued in

a setting that might be willing or inclined to intervene in institutional matters, nor be willing to facilitate change through its rendering of judicial opinion.

Therefore, this dissertation places great emphasis upon the imperative for establishment and implementation of clear, written, fair and relevant criteria, emerging from a broad-based consensus of opinion that includes all concerned parties (including faculty) about what constitutes the expectations of faculty and faculty work, particularly in the academic field of film and digital media. This pro-active effort will preclude a quagmire of conflict and litigation in the future.

Part 6: Summary

I have searched and studied a broad range of literature, building a theoretical and practical understanding of problems and issues relating to the recognition of faculty work in the field of film and digital media; with the goal of developing an informed, fair and proper ways to evaluate artistic, scholarly and professional work that implements film and digital media technologies. My intention is for greater understanding and the development of an appropriate approach to performance evaluation, facilitating better outcomes (in the form of institutional rewards) for faculty who engage in creative, alternative and innovative activities as part of their scholarly work. My hope is that the result of this literature review provides a landscape that is shaped by a range of interrelated sources, a panoramic view that provokes thought and continuously offers insight, meaning and helpful solutions; and is a starting point for further research.

This chapter reflects my understanding of literature relating to the recognition and evaluation of scholarship activity by faculty in the field of film and digital. The framework for this understanding is built upon comparative analysis of conventional and traditional approaches to what constitutes research and faculty work; then contrasting the norm with other perspectives that are appropriately termed as alternative or innovative. Meaning has emerged from a broad and open search for relevant connections in the literature about the recognition and evaluation of faculty work, with specific focus upon the unique character of artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film or digital media.

Data in Chapter 4 demonstrates that the four domains of Boyer (1990) are not common knowledge for faculty in the field of film and digital media; while a review of literature shows only rare cases where Boyer (1990) has been implied. No literature that I found in relation to

educational leadership, administration or performance evaluation addressed, integrated or applied a critical approach to power, and none advocated shared governance, revolutionary change, or other alternative perspectives to issues relating to faculty roles, faculty work, faculty-administrative relations, or the power structure at institutions of higher learning. Generally, it appears that much of the literature assumes that change emerges from the top levels of administration and trickle down to faculty, if at all.